

In voicing these criticisms one does not wish to minimize the immense contributions of these volumes. If, perhaps more questions are raised than fully resolved, this is to the credit of the project as a whole and merely suggests that research of this nature should move forward with the same energy that inspired its first quarter century. Indeed, social historians of modern Europe and demographers in general who neglect these works do so at their peril.

James P. Huzel
University of British Columbia

* * *

S.L. Engerman and R.E. Gallman, (eds.) — *Long-term Factors in American Economic Growth*, Volume 51, Studies in Income and Wealth, National Bureau of Economic Research, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986. Pp. xiii, 884.

The New Economic History emerged in the United States at the end of the 1950s. It was, then, part of the growing trend towards conservative doctrines in Economics and in politico-economic opinion in general. Neoclassical models were used to "predict", that is to deduce, what would have happened if certain historical events had, or had not, taken place. These were the famous "counterfactuals". In the main, the New Economic History came down hard on hypotheses that had been the bases of liberal interpretations of United States economic development. The new view was that slavery had not been economically inefficient, that the railroads had not been an essential part of continental development, and that the "Cross of Gold" had not been such a cross after all.

In Canada there was some of this, but the most effective piece of new style Cleometrics was an assertion that development of the Canadian economy in the period 1870-1926 had only marginally depended on the export of wheat. The implication was, of course, that the massive expenditure on Western development was not economically justified. The wheat staple export was not efficient after all. It was, in fact, an expensive consequence, rather than a profitable cause, of westward expansion. The great Canadian *cliché*, corresponding to the great American *clichés*, was conservative rather than liberal, but that made it no more proof against the Iconoclastic onslaught of the new historical style. The economic interpretation of Confederation, attributable to Queen's University's W.A. Mackintosh, seemed to lose credibility, leaving us with a choice between two propositions: the Canadian economy has been built in defiance of market forces, and will disintegrate if market forces are given full play; or, the national policy of Western expansion was a mistake that will be corrected if market forces are given full play.

The volume under review here bears on these matters in two ways. It is the published papers of the National Bureau's 1986 Annual Conference on Research in Income and Wealth. This is the only one of the Bureau's Annual Conferences that has dealt with the contribution of Economic History to the solution of problems addressed by the Bureau since the Conferences of 1957 (Volume 24) and 1963 (Volume 30), from which the New Economic History of the following two decades emerged. The papers in the publications associated with those earlier Conferences did not fully reflect their importance for the new approach, but Volume 51 is a showpiece of recent developments in that sort of analysis.

The second way in which the volume bears on the matters raised at the beginning of this review follows from the presence in it of three papers dealing with Canadian economic development. The papers, end products of a massive updating of the National Accounts of Canada for the period 1870-1926, were delivered by members of the Department of Economics at Queen's University: M.C. Urquhart, R.M. McNinnis and A.G. Green. The results of the project are an uncontestable contribution to Canadian history. In addition to the factual substance of their work, however, the authors, to a greater or lesser degree, present an interpretation of Canadian economic development that attempts

to circumvent the dilemma posed by the advent of the New Economic History in Canada twenty years earlier.

Not wishing to accept either that Western Expansion was a mistake, or that the free play of market forces is bad for Canada, the authors of the three papers in question reasserted the Mackintosh hypothesis that Confederation and the National Policy of 1878-1926 made good economic sense. Following the lines a Neoclassical model of export-led growth, they have interpreted the data to support the proposition that Western expansion in the period was economically efficient, and that the entailed investments paid off in material terms.

It is a tribute to the rigour with which the Queen's project was carried out that the data produced have been used by Albert Fishlow, at the 1986 Conference, and by Edward Chambers, at the Meeting of the Canadian Economics Association in 1987, to refute the interpretation that its authors have put upon it.

Robin Neill
Carleton University

* * *

Valerie Fildes — *Breasts, Bottles and Babies: A history of infant feeding*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1986. Pp. 462.

Although there have been a number of papers which have studied some issue related to the history of infant feeding, none have examined this topic as extensively. The primary focus of this book is the period from 1500 to 1800. Maternal breastfeeding (neonatal feeding practices, incidence and practice of maternal breastfeeding, problems of lactation and instruments associated with breastfeeding), wet nursing (as a social institution, as the cause of infantile diseases and death, medical opinions about breastfeeding), mixed or supplementary feeding (the foods used, medical opinion about mixed feeding, the practice of mixed feeding), artificial feeding or feeding by hand (incidence, reasons, medical opinion, feeding vessels) and weaning practices (age, method, weaning diet, diseases associated with weaning) are extensively discussed with rich pictorial illustration of feeding practices and feeding vessels. Extensive use is made of quotations from primary sources of their translations. Tables are well utilized to present detailed information concisely. There is also an interesting discussion of infant feeding from antiquity to the Renaissance as an introduction to the major analysis of the following three centuries. Unfortunately, the conclusion of the study at the year 1800 leaves the reader inquisitive about the effect of the medical discoveries of the 19th century on subsequent infant feeding and does leave the text incomplete. A concluding chapter, which briefly highlighted the changes in infant feeding occurring in the 19th century, would have provided a more satisfying conclusion just as the first chapter, which reviewed practices of infant feeding prior to the 1500s, set the stage for detailed examination of infant feeding from 1500 to 1800.

Although this text provides an exceptionally comprehensive and intriguing discussion of the history of infant feeding, there are several deficiencies.

First, on several occasions Valerie Fildes relies on scientifically unvalidated psychological theory to account for major historical events. For example, Fildes accepted a hypothesis that there is a critical period of bonding between mother and child beginning a few minutes after birth and lasting for a period of 12 hours. Fildes then concluded: "It is therefore not surprising that some mothers, especially in the 16th and 17th centuries, were apparently indifferent and content to put their offspring out to nurse. In contrast, women who did breastfeed their infants early on had great love for their children and experienced hopeless grief at their deaths (p. 90)." Fildes also argued that the increased incidence of maternal breastfeeding towards the end of the 17th century led to imprinting of maternal instinct and behavior with greater maternal love towards children in subsequent decades. Critical